

Action Item

Educational Policy and Programs Committee

Approval of the Minutes of the July 31, 2001,
and October 2, 2001, Meetings

MINUTES

Educational Policy and Programs Committee

Meeting of July 31, 2001

Committee members present Kyo “Paul” Jhin, *Chair*
William D. Campbell
Susan Hammer
Odessa P. Johnson
Howard Welinsky
Alan S. Arkatov, *ex officio*
Carol Chandler, *ex officio*

Other Commissioners present
Phillip J. Forhan
Robert A. Hanff
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.
Olivia K. Singh
Melinda G. Wilson

Committee members absent Evonne Seron Schulze
Kyhl Smeby

Call to order Chair Jhin reconvened the Educational Policy and Programs Committee at 12:48 p.m.

An update on the status of student transfer from California Community Colleges

Commission staff member ZoAnn Laurente presented an oral report on the status of transfer between California Community Colleges and its receiving institutions, primarily the California State University and the University of California. She said this was primarily an update with regard to extensive discussions the committee members had last June with representatives of the segments and individuals involved in the transfer function throughout the State. She also provided an overview of collaborative activities along with the Commission’s historic and continuing role in these efforts. Highlights of items discussed in the June 2000 meeting were:

1. The California Community Colleges had entered ambitious student transfer agreements with the California State University, University of California, and the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.
2. There had been a three-year decline in transfers of students from community colleges to baccalaureate-degree granting institutions.
3. Efforts were underway to better define what constitutes a “transfer-eligible” student.
4. Three-quarters of all student transfers occur between the community colleges and CSU; the highest priority for admission of transfers at the State University is given to upper-division students.

5. There is a need to improve data gathering about the community college transfer function and the related student outcomes.

Ms. Laurente said the key points included:

1. California Community Colleges transfers have increased at the State University and the University of California for the most recent academic year, 1999-2000.
2. The past year marked the end of the multiple-year decline with a one-year increase of transfers at both the CSU and UC (meeting the first-year annual goals in their respective MOU's).
3. Collaborative efforts to better understand and improve the transfer process are ongoing and will be guided in part by the work of the Commission's newly established Transfer Advisory Committee composed of transfer policy and process experts from the segments. A Blue Ribbon panel was suggested to conduct focused research over the next 12-18 months.

Ms. Laurente provided the committee with a background information about transfers and showed a chart depicting a comparison between transfer students compared to first-time freshmen over the last 14 to 15 years at UC. Economic factors influence and affect postsecondary enrollment which, in turn, affect transfer students. The access to both the UC and CSU is still an area of concern in terms of space being made available for transfer students.

A discussion followed on the increase in the number of transfer students and the credibility of the data provided by the institutions. Ms. Laurente also provided details on a chart showing diversification of the transfer population, access to UC and CSU and the potential roadblocks to enrollment, and strategies and solutions to address the transfer function.

Commissioner Rodriguez said that it would be helpful for staff to regularly monitor where the MOU's are between the community colleges and the various segments and provide constant reports to the Legislature as to the Commission's perspective on the progress. The Legislature could then be challenged with regard to the issues, challenges and policy questions which would help remove barriers or increase resources where appropriate. It would also be helpful to know what specific institutions benefit from having transfer students attend their campuses. He also suggested CPEC become involved in the Legislative discussions about budget dollars for low-transfer community colleges.

A general discussion followed on the issue of inclusion of all transfer students and the definition of a transfer student. Chair Arkatov reported that he, Vice Chair Chandler, and Director Fox will be visiting with Secretary Adams and will put the issue of tracking transfer students on the agenda.

Commissioner Johnson commented on the dual admissions program and asked for the Commission's support, especially with the additional counselors to be added to the community colleges.

Adjournment Hearing no public comment and having no further business, Chair Jhin adjourned the Educational Policy and Programs Committee at 1:26 p.m.

MINUTES

Educational Policy and Programs Committee

Meeting of October 2, 2001

Committee members present Kyo “Paul” Jhin, *Chair*
William D. Campbell
Howard Welinsky
Alan S. Arkatov, *ex officio*
Carol Chandler, *ex officio*

Other Commissioners present
Melinda G. Wilson

Committee members absent Susan Hammer
Odessa P. Johnson
Evonne Seron Schulze
Kyhle Smeby

Call to order Chair Jhin convened the Educational Policy and Programs Committee at 8:16 a.m.

Regional higher education enrollment demand study Staff member Stacy Wilson reported on in the study to develop enrollment demand projections on a statewide basis for California public colleges and universities. There is a need to address higher education enrollment demand on a regional basis to determine the adequacy of present regional classroom and teaching laboratory space to accommodate future enrollment demand. The statewide projections have been very reliable and the regional projections would be within 96 percent of actual enrollments. The purpose of the study is to:

- ♦ Estimate regional undergraduate demand in comparison to regional physical capacity;
- ♦ Define the limitations and opportunities of expanding the State’s higher education enterprise regionally to accommodate undergraduate demand.
- ♦ Address key policy issues raised by various educational constituency groups and legislative entities.
- ♦ Compile useful regional demographic, socioeconomic, and labor market information to support local regional planning efforts.

Mr. Wilson said the study used the same geographic region designations as those in the college eligibility study, so that regional enrollment demand could be compared to regional college eligibility. He explained that the capacity figures were based on State-adopted space and utilization standards. He noted that substantial capacity deficits are

anticipated in all 11 community-college regions, which translate to a -315,058 FTES capacity deficit by 2010.

He mentioned that the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office most recent five-year capacity outlay plan anticipates that about 677,000 assignable square feet (ASF) of lecture space and 2.9 million ASF of laboratory space will be needed by Fall 2006 to accommodate new student demand. The requested lecture ASF would support about 105,160 additional FTES and the planned laboratory ASF would support about an additional 75,000 FTES of laboratory instruction. Even if all of the proposed renovation and modernization projects proposed are authorized by the State, the Commission's analysis indicates that a -135,000 FTES community college capacity deficit would remain by Fall 2010.

The California State University (CSU) system was estimated to have capacity deficits in 10 of the 11 regions by year 2004 and in all 11 regions by 2010, reflecting a net -92,117 FTES capacity deficit. The State University's most recent capital improvement plan seeks funding to provide for, among other purposes, an additional 40,628 FTES capacity over the next five years. Even if the additional capacity is funded, the Commission's analysis indicates that a -51,489 FTES capacity deficit would remain by 2010.

Mr. Wilson reviewed concerns raised by the California State University system and the California Community College system. The State University System agreed with the regional enrollment projections but the system was concerned with how capacity information will be interpreted among legislators. The CSU preferred that the additional 40,000 FTS capacity not be addressed in the report as it may be misconstrued. That is, capital outlay plans change frequently based on numerous factors, including the fiscal health of the State's economy.

Community college analysts also agreed with the regional enrollment demand and capacity forecasts, but expressed concerned because the report only addressed classroom and teaching laboratory space types, and not support space, such as museums, childcare centers, auditoriums, and other facilities for which there are no space standards. Mr. Wilson maintained that it was not possible to translate ASF to FTES capacity without space and utilization standards.

Mr. Wilson explained that staff intend to meet with representatives of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities and the University of California to determine how the model could be adapted to estimate regional enrollment demand in relation to regional FTES capacity for the independent sector and for the UC system.

Commissioner Welinsky questioned the extent to which the standards had been tested or analyzed, and if summer school or year-round school had been factored into the analysis.

Mr. Wilson acknowledged that summer school and year-round school had been factored in indirectly. He indicated that institutions are not held strictly to the State standards, but rather are used as a guide when determining space deficits.

Commissioner Welinsky requested clarification as to whether the standards are based on 12 months or nine months.

Mr. Kevin Woolfork explained that the lecture standards call for lecture classrooms to be in use 53 hours per week out of a total possible usage of 70 hours (i.e., 8 a.m. to 10 p.m., Monday through Friday). He explained that the advent of State-funded year-round instruction was new and inclusion of weekend or summer utilization in the standards would not be feasible at this time.

Commissioner Arkatov led a discussion during which the following points were made:

- ◆ Both the State University and the Community Colleges systems had expanded their system-wide database so that individual campuses can report the amount of FTES generated through the various distance education methods.
- ◆ The degree-credit transferable distance/online learning courses needed to be represented in the enrollment demand estimates.
- ◆ The priority of the study was to define the magnitude of demand on a regional basis in relation to current capacity. Then, monitor and examine the extent to which year-around operations, joint facility uses, and technology/distributed learning are effective in assisting an institution in expanding physical capacity without constructing new classrooms and teaching laboratories.
- ◆ The study needed to be completed for the University of California and for the independent universities and colleges to comprehend the total opportunities available for accommodating students.
- ◆ The current State standards are based on a nine-month school year.
- ◆ The capacity forecasts were inaccurate if based on State standards using a nine-month school year, as a large number of students enrolling in the summer session are not represented in the forecast.
- ◆ The regional forecast study used both within region and out-of-region participation rates in deriving the regional forecast.
- ◆ Consistent definitions of the various forms of media used between the community colleges, the State University, and the University of California system needed to be established in order to refine the statistics on distance learning.

Staff member David Leveille reminded the Commission about the ongoing AB 1123 study dealing with the financing of technology, telecommunications, and distance learning. He mentioned that the above issues relating to distance learning are part of an ongoing dialogue among all sectors of higher education. He indicated that a report addressing the definitional and financing issues would be available in spring or summer of 2002.

Commissioner Chandler complemented Mr. Wilson for his diligent and useful work of formulating the forecasts.

Mr. Wilson acknowledged the complexity of formulating capacity projections, and recognized the need and the challenge of addressing the current capital outlay plans of the community colleges and the CSU.

Chair Jhin recommended that regional enrollment demand be broken-down by on-campus demand and by the demand generated by distance education protocols.

**Status Report on
Proposed Revised
Guidelines for
Review of
Proposed New
Campuses and
Educational
Centers**

Staff member Gil Velazquez presented a status update on the revision to the Commission's guidelines on proposed new public university campuses, community colleges and educational centers. He said that the current law required the Commission to advise the governor and the Legislature on proposed new campuses, community colleges and educational centers. The Commission adopted these guidelines in 1975. He noted that the Commission, as a result of changes in the higher education planning environment elected to revise the current guidelines or reviewing new campuses and educational centers.

Mr. Velazquez said the substantial changes occurring in the educational planning environment, principally the surge of new students anticipated for the next 10 years commonly known as "tidal wave II". He said this surge required a new look and strategy in terms of potential opportunities for increasing capacity, and an area of opportunity under discussion is off-campus collaborative centers where one or more segments collaboratively provide educational services for purposes of meeting the regional enrollment demand.

Mr. Velazquez reported on the establishment of a workgroup with representatives from the public segments, independent colleges and universities and State control agencies. The critical issues under discussion were detailed on tab 7 beginning on page 8, and that the workgroup would meet again October 24, 2001 to discuss issues regarding collaborative centers ranging from definitions to the Commission review threshold for collaborative centers. The final recommendations will be reported as an information item at the December meeting. He noted the workgroup is making encouraging progress.

Commissioner Campbell inquired about recommendations provided from the individual segments regarding the definition of collaborative centers.

Mr. Velazquez indicated the feedback from the individual segments advised not restricting the definition in terms of capital outlay and included additional considerations in the definition of collaborative center. He explained the committee was currently engaged in a discussion of the specific trigger for Commission review of a collaborative center.

Director Fox thanked Mr. Velazquez for his work on this project and his help coordinating the trip to Calexico and Mexicali.

Commissioner Arkatov asked if the Legislative Analyst's Office was participating in the work group. Mr. Velazquez confirmed that members of the work group included representatives from LAO.

Adjournment

Having no further business, Chair Jhin adjourned the Educational Policy and Programs Committee at 8:51 a.m.
